DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 267 SP 003 050

The North East Regional Conference on Quality Educational Standards in Teaching. Summary Findings (Albany, March 7-8, 1969). QuEST Report Series, #1.

American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 69
Note-12p.
Available from-American Federation of Teachers, Department of Research, 1012 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 ($0.20)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.70
Descriptors-Agency Role, Decentralization, Instructional Technology, Problem Children, *Standards, Teacher Associations, Teacher Education, *Teaching

This booklet reports a workshop conference sponsored by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) Council for Quality Educational Standards in Teaching (QuEST) to involve delegates from locals in clarifying and solving professional problems. Summary of the workshop on "The Diffuclut Child" includes description of the effects of disruptive children on instruction, discussion of emotional disturbances in children, recommendations to the QuEST Committee for study, and guidelines for programs for the emotionally handicapped. The workshop report on "Uses of Technology in Education" discusses the need for teacher involvement in choice and development of technical innovations, lists topics needing discussion before basic policy is developed, and makes recommendations to AFT regarding an evaluation and information-dissemination program. The report on "Decentralization" (a restructuring of a large school system in order to share decisionmaking power by restructuring the roles of parent and teacher) contains suggested means of gaining teacher policymaking powers and lists recommendations for promoting closer alignment with the community. The "Teacher Training" workshop summary notes shortcomings of inservice education and lists recommendations to the union for establishing minimum standards through collective bargaining and the development of cooperative relationships with colleges and universities, state departments, and other agencies. (JS)

ED032267

AFT QuEST Paper 1. Occassional Papers from the AFT Program for Quality Educational Standards in Teaching (QuEST)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WHAT IS THE AFT-*QuEST* PROGRAM?

Persistent and emerging problems face the nation's schools:

Effective teaching
Use of paraprofessionals
Decentralization and community control
Teacher education and certification
Implementation of the More Effective Schools concept
Eradicating racism in education

As the teacher revolution sweeps through urban America, the American Federation of Teachers becomes increasingly aware of its special responsibilities to offer solutions to these other problems. In January, 1968, the AFT's executive council, with representatives on it from most of the nation's big cities, held a special two-day conference to consider these problems and the AFT's responsibilities.

Out of this conference came a mandate for a *continuing body of active and concerned AFT educators* who could—

Anticipate some of the emerging problems resulting from the rapid social changes in our society;

Meet on a regular basis;

Stimulate and initiate confrontations between teachers and these problems at state, local, and national levels;

Organize and coordinate regional and national conferences;

Prepare tentative positions for action by AFT legislative bodies; and

Suggest action programs to implement their findings.

Thus was born QuEST.

Reports on QuEST conferences are published regularly in a QuEST Reports series. Papers on topics of current educational concern are available in a QuEST Papers series. For a list of Reports and Papers currently available, write:

Department of Research
American Federation of Teachers
1012 14th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

SP003050

SUMMARY FINDINGS

THE NORTH EAST REGIONAL CONFERENCE

on

QUALITY EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS IN TEACHING

held at

The DeWitt Clinton Hotel, Albany, New York

March 7-8
1969

Auspices: The QuEST Council (American Federation of Teachers)

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The AFT Council for Quality Educational Standards in Teaching (QuEST), is concerned with the many persistent and emerging problems facing the nation's schools. Its main purpose is to initiate, stimulate, and coordinate local, state, and national discussions on, and concern with, the professional aspects of the Teacher Union movement.

The North East Regional QuEST Conference is one of a series initiated by the national QuEST Council. Hopefully, similar ones may be later sponsored by local and state affiliates to obtain grassroots involvement in understanding the nature of the many educational problems facing the school systems, and in finding ways to meet and overcome these problems.

The North East Regional QuEST Conference consisted of four workshops composed of delegates from locals in the North East region. Each workshop met continuously and concerned itself with the one problem assigned to it. The workshop themes were:

1. The Difficult Child
2. The Uses of Technology in Education
3. Decentralization
4. Teacher Training

A summary, plenary session, held just prior to adjournment, discussed reports presented by each workshop leader, who later submitted written statements containing the basic workshop findings. Copies of these statements are enclosed.

These reports have also been sent to each conference participant and to local, state, and national AFT leaders, for study. The attached reports do not necessarily indicate AFT policy. The Executive Council will consider the workshop findings and direct AFT policy in these areas.

Simon Beagle
Executive Secretary
The AFT QuEST Council and
Conference Chairman

THE DIFFICULT CHILD
Workshop Leader: Louis Hay

OVER-ALL PERSPECTIVES

QuEST's concern with the difficult child parallels that of the Kerner Report in stressing that the problem of the disruptive child is nationwide. Teachers throughout the country give the highest priority to this group as a major roadblock to effective education. However, the concern with these children cannot be separated from the need for the effective school program generally because much of this problem could be prevented or competently coped with if the schools were organized along the lines recommended by the AFT More Effective Schools committee.

There is poignancy in the fact that there is already a tremendous backlog of knowledge adequate for a full range of programs for the amelioration of the problems of handicapped children, including the emotionally and socially maladjusted. Schools will increasingly require reorganization toward becoming therapeutic communities, since there never will be adequate alternatives. However, there is room for both long-term planning and immediate restructuring that can make life more meaningful to both children and the professional staff.

These are some of the focused perspectives that apply to disruptive children particularly.

1. Teachers, extensively, have been compelled to retain children with long histories of destructive behavior, damaging to the morale and functioning of a class and teacher.
2. Frequently, children have been retained or suspended or returned to class without the involvement of the teacher in the decision-making process.
3. The overwhelming significance of the problem is highlighted by the fact that if 3 to 5 percent of our school population falls within the category of the seriously unruly, teachers of New York State, for example, are faced with a population of 60,000 to 100,000 of such children.
4. Teacher and class morale are so seriously damaged by the disorderly child and the disrespect for the teacher's authority that good class functioning is grossly and extensively impeded.
5. The requirements, tasks, and responsibilities of urban teaching are distinctively different from those of previous eras. Teachers need the most skillful help in upgrading procedures, classroom management, and curriculum. Such skills will appreciably reduce classroom confrontation.

ESSENTIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Acting-out, destructive behavior is the person's mode of coping with his problems defensively, and is readily equitable with other symptoms (some less socially destructive) like apathy, withdrawal, masked retardation, and allergies.
2. An extensive number of these children early in their school years, while they did reveal indications of malfunctioning, were not destructive, negative, or difficult. The extensive inability of schools and society to adequately meet the needs of these children pushes them into and sustains them in careers of social destructiveness. Similar children, with as extensive patterns of social pathology, when properly supported, have

achieved significant social and educational growth, concomitant with the attenuation of the social pathology.

3. Malfunctioning children of no age should be stereotyped in terms of their potential for rehabilitation.
4. Within the destructive population, the range of psychic disorder is extensively different. The gamut includes the psychotic as well as the momentarily disruptive, responding to current situational pressures.
5. The demand for suspension is not the result, alone, of the disruptive child's behavior. It is often a reaction to a large number of major school insufficiencies, such as those of over-large classes, inadequate administration, inadequate supportive services, insufficient teaching tools, inadequate teacher training, inappropriate curricula, and all of the other deficits highlighted in the Effective Schools Committee's analysis. There is also a consequent displacement of anger, hurt and frustration from these upon the children.
6. The children we are considering, invariably, have long histories of disruption and challenge to the well-being of class and teacher. Consequently, it is essential and feasible that we build resources to cope with these crises before they become overwhelming.
7. We feel strongly that the appropriate demand and concern of teachers to be involved in the disposition of these children have been seriously violated. We believe that there are certain controlling premises that should govern the procedures for coping with these disturbing children that will be effectively respectful of the needs of the teachers and of the children.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A national standing QuEST Committee on the handicapped child with a special focus on the difficult child.
2. Local QuEST committees that work with the national committee on the handicapped child with special emphasis upon the difficult child.
3. The preparation of Manuals in consultation with locals on classroom management and of the various programs that have proven effective.
4. QuEST grant designs and demonstration programs in QuEST partnership with union and with local QuEST committees and School Boards of Education.
5. QuEST grant funded consultants available to locals for the initiation and replication of a range of proven programs.
6. QuEST cooperative programs with universities that involve consultation with AFT locals in structuring courses, workshops specifically to meet teachers' needs in coping with disturbed and disturbing children.

ADDENDUM: KIND AND ORGANIZATION OF SERVICES TO MEET EMOTIONAL HANDICAPS

COMMON ASPECTS OF ALL SERVICES

To meet the needs of a large and diversified sub-population of children who are emotionally disturbed, a whole range of related programs and services is necessary. There are several basic perspectives and components that are essential to all programs. Among these are:

1. The development of a comprehensive case study as an ongoing process for every child considered difficult, disruptive, emotionally disturbed.
2. Individual and group work with parents.

3. A qualitive physical examination of each child with resources for implementation of clinical recommendations. A hospital affiliation is indicated. Note: Studies of deprived populations at large and of the Junior Guidance population in particular reveal a higher incidence of physical disabilities than in the general population.
4. Weekly team conferences that include administrators, teachers, and representatives of support services. The over-all perspectives and applications should be planned and carried out by the nuclear multi-disciplinary team.
5. Where the service is school or institution-located but incorporates an educational service, curricula should be developed especially tailored to the particular child and to the particular group through a multi-disciplinary team involvement.
6. Inservice and university-based training programs for all professional personnel involved. Internship programs should be developed.
7. Community involvement should be planned and sustained in two directions:
   (1) With community agencies for cooperatively probing the related problems and for jointly planning to cope with them.
   (2) With community leaders toward sympathetic identification and cooperative consideration of local needs, resistances, and supports.
8. A complementary recreational program to include after-school and summer planning.
9. Evaluation by a separate research unit.

Note: If a program of special classes is being considered, then controlled intake is crucial. Such intake should be governed by the appropriate placement of the child within an appropriate group. The needs of a class group are too frequently obscured by the needs of a child. An imappropriate placement of one child might disorganize the delicate balance of the functioning group. For some children, a particular program is contra-indicated.

-Summarized by Louis Hay

TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION
Workshop Leader: William Darrall

There was general agreement that teachers stand in the midst of a technological revolution, but that the teacher, who must eventually use the tools of technology, is the forgotten person as technological innovations are prepared.

The tremendous pressure from school media producers to buy and use expensive materials in the schools looms as a threat to the teacher's freedom in eclectic use of media in that educational media producers promote the sale of "systems" of hardware and software that may lead teachers to "locked in" method and technique, all too rigid for the good of true educational goals. Something like a "we paid for it -- now you damn well better use it" attitude prevails with boards of education, administrators, and supervisors.

The teachers' lack of status became readily apparent as discussion unfolded. Teachers, as a group, are largely overlooked in the planning, the implementation and continuing consultation as to putting technology into perspective. It is almost as if a coalition of the educational bureaucracy and the educational media producers exists--from which the teacher is purposely excluded. Whether a purposeful coalition exists or whether a status-quo lack of communication exists, is open to conjecture, but the fact remains that, by and large, the teachers are the last to be informed in the area of technology. (Typical examples of this are: The New York State Education Department, almost in isolation, has developed plans for a Computer Assisted Instructional Network. At the national level, the Educational Technology Act of 1969 has been forged, almost entirely, without consultation with classroom teachers.)

Although there is much to be criticized and the thrust of technology is not fully understood by the teaching profession, teachers are willing and actively interested in innovation and technology which will reinforce true learning and provide meaningful contributions to sound educational goals. The new wave of innovation in the form of technology needs sincere and probing evaluation to separate gadgets, gimmicks, and gimcracks from the meaningful devices which are available.

Before firm educational policy should be made at the state or AFT level, further thoughtful discussion should be engaged in on the following topics:

- Is there a path which will lead to the very ideal situation in which the teacher, as an educated and particularly well-trained sensitive adult, may eclectically choose what tools (technological and otherwise) he finds work best?
- What is the best way to bridge the "clinic" to "classroom" gap? Should not the planning of educational media take into account the current differences that exist between "where what they are doing worked" and "where they hope it will work?" Can bureaucracies and educational media producers be made aware that there are qualitative and quantitative (as well as atmospheric) differences between the lab and the school?
- Is the public getting an honest look at real educational problems and proposed solutions, or only a predetermined "public relations" picture of technology and innovation? Does not the teacher have a role in presenting critical thinking regarding the educational media producers' concepts and systems?

• To what extent is the human element being shuffled aside as the "new" technology and hardware approach to school problems emphasize easy and "controllable" answers to complex problems? How can teachers insure that we don't throw out the baby with the bathwater?

• Are educational media producers responsive to the needs of classroom teachers and children, or do they expect teachers and children to respond to their products? Who should be responsive to whom?

• Can there be an effective way to "police" or rate and rank materials and media? More properly--do not mediocre programs and materials destroy the effectiveness of machines?

• Should not an overview of available media and devices be made accessible to teachers in order to involve the concerned teacher organizations in screening, selecting, rating, and descriptively evaluating the existing technological innovations?

• To what extent should teachers remain laissez-faire in their attitudes toward the technology explosion?

RECOMMENDATIONS

That an AFT Committee on Technology and Innovation be formed to act as an effective evaluating and information-disseminating body on technology and innovation--to provide an overview useful to teachers in making sound educational decisions.

That the implications of the technology explosion are far reaching and, as presently conceived by educational media producers and educational agencies, would require a total restructuring of the schools as we know them. That the AFT and state federations have the duty to become knowledgeable in this area.

That state federations, through their Educational Policies Committees, reconsider and redefine the questions contained in this summation with an eye toward drafting knowledgeable and effective resolutions for presentation to state conventions.

DECENTRALIZATION
Workshop Leader: Sandra Feldman

Decentralization was defined as a restructuring of a large school system in order to share decision-making power by restructuring the roles of parent and teacher. Decentralization was favored, but not "community control," which implies *exclusive*, autonomous power and authority in a small sub-district, thereby endangering the maintenance of standards and leading to separatism. There was a reaffirmation of school integration with decentralization, and with teachers becoming militant integrationists.

Within this definition, decentralization will take varying forms in different areas, some with powers being shared, some held by local boards, and some by the central board.

The decentralization workshop first focused its concern on teacher power and the possibilities of its expansion and development in decentralized systems to include educational and professional policy-making powers, which teachers, generally, do not at present have. The following vehicles were suggested:

1. Teacher representative committees to:
   (a) Identify educational needs of children in cooperation with the local school boards and community.
   (b) Prepare the relevant curriculum material.
   (c) Define and explain the aims, methods, and materials, and the teacher's role to the parents, as well as to the teachers themselves.
   (d) Define the role of paraprofessionals vis-a-vis the parents, and the paraprofessionals themselves.
2. Teacher time to be negotiated for those serving on the representative committee. Either school time, or paid after-school time, must be negotiated for regular parent-teacher meetings in order to allow for maximum parent-teacher cooperation and communication.
3. Community-teacher communications, and teacher influence, must be felt on many levels:
   (a) School level, through parent-teacher councils.
   (b) District level, through union district representatives meeting with local boards, through school-community liaison committees meeting with district superintendents on a regular basis.
   (c) On a city-wide level, so that school needs for resources, for smaller classes, etc., will be identified in negotiations with the central board.
   (d) On a national level, as part of a progressive movement to end poverty and to obtain federal support for the nation's schools.

The workshop agreed on the need for better public relations, although this is not the total answer. Also, all agreed that teachers, through their union, must function as social critics and must develop a broad social outlook.

Of paramount importance is to obtain for teachers the tools needed to make possible more effective teaching and job satisfaction. Teacher despair and defeat are caused by poor teaching-learning conditions. The union must make every effort to prevent its members from turning inward in the fact of attack. It must keep on its present course of fighting for substantive change, and for greater involvement of parents in school policy making. The union must help teachers to forge alliances with those concerned with the creation of a viable and effective school system.

The following specifics to accomplish this were suggested:

Restructuring roles demands closer alignment with the community-

1. Parent-teacher councils in each school.
2. Use of district leaders elected by building representatives to handle grievances and to work with community groups.
3. Formation of impartial review boards to handle legitimate parental complaints on nonprofessional matters.
4. Ongoing internal education to change, when necessary, the behavior and responses of teachers, black and white.
5. Teachers to revise curriculum to make it more relevant to children's needs.
6. Negotiating leaves for teachers for research and writing curriculum.
7. More teacher involvement in matters of public interest--e.g., demand for low-cost housing financed through school bonds.
8. After-school teaching programs.
9. Integrated, preschool nurseries in low-income neighborhoods, to which teachers working in the neighborhood can bring their own children.
10. More use of parental conferences (perhaps eliminating report cards).
11. Accountability for educational results, to be concerned not only with test results, but with teacher turnover, facilities in the schools, textbooks, supplies, etc.
12. Faculty selection of teacher-trainers.
13. Insuring that the educational supervisor is divorced from the business administrator.
14. Teacher involvement in setting standards for teacher-recruitment programs.
15. Election of (or otherwise democratically selected) local school boards through which parents and community can affect school policy, hire superintendents, set up programs to meet local needs, etc.

TEACHER TRAINING
Workshop Leader: Robert Bhaerman

The discussion touched initially on a number of topics in the general area of teacher education and certification, e.g., some of the specifics were: establishing minimum standards through collective bargaining, "policing our own ranks," various routes to teaching, i.e., the paraprofessional route and the more traditional path of entry through colleges and universities.

The first session touched on all of the above topics, raising many questions but offering few recommendations. The all-day session Saturday was much more focused and, indeed, did conclude with specific recommendations. Of the many items discussed, the following received the most attention:

Inservice Education: Courses are not always fully tied in with the salary scale, but should be. They should be offered from extension divisions of colleges and universities, and should be taught by people who are successful, those who are actually doing the job. These courses should deal, for the most part, with specific techniques and practices, i.e., they should be "how-to" courses. They should be held during the regular school day. College credit should be given. There should be no loss of funds or time for the teacher assuming on-the-job training.

The Continuous Progress Alternative: The necessity for compulsion and bribery was also considered, as was the concept of "volunteerism," i.e., "the professional spark" which is all too often destroyed by the school system. What is needed is a new milieu to encourage this.

Some of the major recommendations were as follows:

1. That the working relationship on the part of the union, colleges and universities, and the state education departments, be established to enhance meaningful reforms in the area of teacher education and certification.
2. That the union should work toward alleviating rigidity in school systems, which should be structured to enable teachers to get "real help" when needed.
3. That released time for inservice education, particularly for beginning teachers, be established in collective-bargaining contracts.
4. That the extension division arrangement with colleges for inservice courses be established.
5. That, since working through state channels is often slow, the union should consider ways in which to function with such groups as the Education Commission of the States and the federal government, in order to develop AFT programs and procedures on certification and inservice education which other groups can emulate.
6. That the AFT should consider the negotiability of all of these items and should explore new collective-bargaining approaches for such things as internship and inservice programs (particularly the idea of released time).
7. That an accountability (effectiveness) study be conducted by either state education departments or the USOE to try to assess why schools are not performing as well as they might be. This would not duplicate National Assessment, but would be an independent attempt to evaluate significant factors in education and attempt to establish higher standards.

Several other specific recommendations were:

--resolutions on educational policy matters to be proposed at the AFT convention;
--negotiation of funds for research and development in local contracts;
--establishment of a clearinghouse on QuEST items dealing with these areas, including a compilation of contract items by AFT bargaining units;
--regional accreditation agencies must be pressured to utilize their influence in the development of standards;
--establishment of communication on QuEST by the national office, local presidents, and state federations;
--establishment of an on-going council for educational policies (in other words, our already-conceived QuEST Council).

Finally, there should be a push for action on the local level, e.g., hopefully, one of the things that will come out of this QuEST conference is establishment of a working relationship between the UFT and the UFCT. As a result of this meeting, members of these two locals will draw up an agenda to discuss a cooperative program of teacher training. This, ultimately, could lead to broader discussion with additional locals in the New York metropolitan area (as is now planned), as well as to the development of various concrete proposals such as a federal grant for a pilot program in the internship area. This initial UFT-UFCT meeting is one of the immediate activities coming as a result of the QuEST meeting, since it will generate an AFT action program in teacher training.